

CHAPTER 11 - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The project team met with various neighborhood groups, businesses, and other interested parties. Many people support the overall Denny/Lake Union Project because it will reduce CSOs into Lake Union and Elliott Bay. Concerns have been raised regarding stormwater discharges to the lake and bay, as these flows often contain contaminants from roadways and parking areas. Both verbal and written comments received in response to mailings and meetings have been addressed in this final SEPA SEIS/NEPA EA.

11.1 PLANNING

The 1991 decision to begin a preliminary community involvement process for the Denny/Lake Union Project was based on the magnitude of the project and the potential for widespread community impacts. This process consisted of a team of Metro and Seattle staff briefing representatives from community groups, area businesses, environmental organizations, and regulatory agencies, as well as elected officials, Indian Tribes, and other interested parties. The purpose of the briefings was to collect factors for consideration in developing project alternatives from individuals with an interest or influence in the project area (Appendix P). Over 100 individuals and groups attended the meetings. In January of 1993, a briefing was held for the Eastlake Community Council. An overview of the joint Metro/Seattle project was presented, along with the alternatives under consideration. Approximately 20 people attended the meeting.

As the planning and design efforts continued, the public process was accelerated and formalized. King County Metro, with Seattle participation, organized and widely publicized a Public Meeting at the Port of Seattle on June 28, 1994, to review the CSO control alternatives. A notice of the meeting and update of the project was mailed out to area business owners, residents and other interested parties. Approximately 20 people attended the meeting. This meeting provided a public forum for discussing the range of alternatives; input gathered from the meeting was used in selecting a preferred proposal.

11.2 PHASE 1 - SEATTLE'S EASTLAKE SEWER ENLARGEMENT

Seattle and the Eastlake Community Council, with King County Metro participation, organized and widely publicized a Public Meeting in August 1994 to seek input from the community directly affected by construction impacts from Phase 1. There was discussion of the Phase 1 Preferred Alternative, and the community was supportive of the project. The meeting was attended by approximately 20 people. Periodic updates were held throughout 1995 at meetings of the Eastlake Community Council.

Seattle, with participation by King County Metro, held a Public Hearing for Phase 1 at the Seward School to discuss the selected alternative for the Facilities Plan, construction schedule, and potential impacts. Approximately 25 people attended the meeting. Major issues raised by citizens included a history of sewer backups in the Eastlake Community, the relative benefits of sewer separation, and limiting stormwater discharges to Lake Union. Concern was expressed that the project account for the capacity needs of future development. Concerns were also raised about construction impacts, new sewer routing, parking displacement, construction equipment staging, noise, private property access, emergency vehicle access, the impact on businesses from travel lane restrictions, hours of work, and protection of private property. In addition, citizens requested coordination of overlapping public

projects and that neighborhood-requested transportation improvements be built as part of the CSO project. On September 27, 1995, a Memorandum of Agreement was signed by the Seattle Engineering Department and the Eastlake Community Council for the purpose of resolving issues of concern, specifically parking and noise, to the Eastlake Community.

11.3 PHASES 2 AND 3 - SEATTLE'S SOUTH LAKE UNION SEWER ENLARGEMENT AND KING COUNTY'S CSO STORAGE

In June 1995, King County Metro mailed an EIS scoping notice to about 200 individuals from agencies, affected tribes, business owners, environmental groups, community organizations, and citizens. The notice provided background of CSO controls, summarized proposed alternatives, and requested comments on important issues and concerns that should be addressed in the SEIS/EA.

King County Metro, with Seattle participation, organized and publicized a public Scoping Meeting at The Mountaineers on June 27, 1995. The objective of the meeting was to seek comments from the community on the proposed alternatives, impacts and mitigation measures for the Denny/Lake Union Project. The meeting was attended by 16 people. Written comments were received through July 12, 1995. Three citizens provided verbal comments at the meeting and five written comments were received. The major issues raised by citizens in the meeting related to the storage facility along Elliott Avenue, tunneling, Mercer Street, soft soils near East Mercer, and storage in south Lake Union. The written comments addressed water quality in Lake Union, construction impacts, public education on water quality impacts, recreation beach in Myrtle Edwards Park, access during construction, and stormwater controls.

11.4 PROJECT UPDATE

Since the Denny/Lake Union Project schedule was extended, a decision was made by KCWPC to inform the public of the new schedule in a Project Update. The update described changes to the project since the Phases 2 and 3 Scoping Notice and included a schedule of project activities. A request was made for people to sign up for a citizens committee to assist in developing architectural designs for the CSO control facility on the Elliott West site. The Update was mailed in mid-May 1996 to approximately 10,000 residents and businesses in the project vicinity. Twenty-three phone calls were received on the mailing to request participation on the architecture/landscaping committee or to request addition to the mailing list for the environmental documents. These updates will continue throughout the project, as necessary.

11.5 PHASE 4 - KING COUNTY'S CSO TREATMENT

As described in the June 1995 Scoping Notice for Phases 2 and 3, Phase 3 would reduce CSOs at the Denny Regulator by 50 percent and control CSOs at the Dexter Regulator and south Lake Union to one untreated discharge per year. At that time, King County Metro planned to defer discussions on Phase 4, which involved a reduction at the Denny Regulator to one untreated discharge per year, until the long-range Regional Wastewater Services Plan was completed. However, in March 1996, KCWPC decided to design Phases 3 and 4 concurrently based on schedule, costs and the proposed long-range plan strategies. Therefore, a Phase 4 Scoping Notice with request for comments was issued on June 18, 1996. Comments were accepted until July 3, 1996. A request for an extension of the comment period was made by the Queen Anne Community Council. KCWPC issued a Notice of Extension of Comment

Period for Scoping in the SEPA Register on July 3, 1996. A notice was published in The Seattle Times on Friday, July 5, 1996. The comment period was extended until July 18, 1996.

Twelve comment letters were received during the Phase 4 scoping period. An Internet address was set up for the project to receive public comments through E-mail. Two comment letters were received over the Internet. The issues raised during Phase 4 scoping are briefly listed below.

- ◆ Alternatives: Elliott Avenue, none-park and alternative locations; piping to West Point
- ◆ Air Resources: prevailing winds, odors
- ◆ Water Resources: reduction of overflows, street and property runoff
- ◆ Environmental Health: chemicals stored on site, spills
- ◆ Land and Shoreline Use: West Point, Discovery Park and community impacts
- ◆ Parks and Recreation: use of bike path, coordination with Seattle Center, pedestrian connection to park, viewing platform, public toilets, utility hookups, historic information
- ◆ Aesthetics: visible facilities, landscaping, views from hills, architectural design
- ◆ Transportation: traffic, cumulative impacts, access, sludge removal, anchorage area
- ◆ Socioeconomics: property values
- ◆ Project Costs: estimated costs, funding

11.6 JOINT SEPA/NEPA DOCUMENT

A meeting was held in June, 1996, between the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), and King County Water Pollution Control Division (KCWPC) to discuss the project schedule and required environmental documents. A decision was made to produce a joint SEPA Supplemental EIS/NEPA EA for Phases 2 and 3/4, rather than two separate documents. The schedule was issuance of a draft document in early 1997 with the final document issued in late 1997. KCWPC met with Darigold and the Queen Anne Community Council to discuss the project and proposed alternatives.

11.7 DRAFT SEPA SUPPLEMENTAL EIS/NEPA EA

On May 27, 1997, twenty-five copies of the SEPA SEIS/NEPA EA were distributed to potentially interested or concerned government agencies and officials. The remaining documents were mailed out by June 9, 1997. The 30-day comment period was extended another 19 days by a notice published in The Seattle Times and letters sent to the agencies and public who had received a draft joint document. A Public Hearing on the draft SEPA SEIS/NEPA EA was held on June 12, 1997, at The Mountaineers, and attended by 27 people. Verbal and written comments were taken at the hearing. Appendix T includes the hearing transcript, comment letters and responses to both verbal and written comments received during the comment period. Comments received included the following topics: project alignments, erosion, vibrations, odors, outfalls, sediment remediation, habitat issues, tribal fisheries, shellfishing, electrical efficiency, stored chemicals, impacts to parks and bike paths, architectural treatments, parking loss, street closures, traffic, anchorage area, relocating businesses, project schedule, public communication, and the West Point Settlement Agreement.

King County followed the mandated SEPA public involvement requirements: property owners notification, notice boards, and legal notices. All property owners within 500 feet of any project alternative were notified by letter of the project; this included over 3,000 letters. Notice boards were

posted in the South Lake Union area, in Myrtle Edwards Park, and at the Elliott West site. Legal notices of document availability were published twice in the Queen Anne News and the Seattle Times and a public information document was mailed to various community groups and individuals.

11.8 NEWSLETTER

The first project newsletter was mailed out in mid-December 1997 to over 10,000 residents and businesses in or near the project area. The newsletter described the project, schedule and environmental impacts. A mail-back form was included to allow people to remain on the project mailing list. Newsletters will continue to be issued throughout design and construction of the project.

11.9 FINAL SEPA SUPPLEMENTAL EIS/NEPA EA

No SEPA action will be taken on this final joint document for seven days after issuance. No NEPA action will be taken on this final joint document for 30 days after issuance of the document and FONSI. *For information regarding appeals, contact Planner-In-Charge: Karen Watkins, King County Department of Natural Resources, Wastewater Treatment Division, Environmental Planning, 821 Second Avenue, M.S. 81, Seattle, Washington, 98104-1598, (206)684-1171.*

11.10 FUTURE

Efforts are currently being made to continue the public outreach effort for the project started in 1991. The objectives include establishing an understanding of the project, determining the fundamental values influencing opinion on the subject, keeping the public as informed as possible, and dealing with their concerns in a realistic way. Meetings will continue to be held with the community councils of those neighborhoods located within the vicinity of the construction project, as well as with any other groups expressing interest in the project. Meetings will be held during final design with the intent of gathering input and providing design updates and during the construction phase to keep the community informed on the status of the construction activities.